



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/536,736	05/27/2005	Louis Dubertret	P08652US00/BAS	4693
881 7590 07/29/2009 STITES & HARBISON PLLC 1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET SUITE 900 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER KARPINSKI, LUKE E	
			ART UNIT 1616	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/20/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/536,736

Applicant(s)

DUBERTRET ET AL.

Examiner

LUKE E. KARPINSKI

Art Unit

1616

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) LUKE E. KARPINSKI.(3) BILL SCHULMAN.(2) JOHANN RICHTER.(4) BENOIT DUBERTRET.

Date of Interview: 17 July 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 25.

Identification of prior art discussed: Neam et al and Chen.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The ZnO particles of Neam et al were discussed and the inventor explained that said particles are not considered quantum dots, further, the particles of Neam et al. do not have a core/shell structure and therefore no longer read on claim 25. 112 rejection issues regarding claim 25 were also discussed, including the method of using language and the "treated in this way" language..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/L. E. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 1616

/Johann R. Richter/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616